

### REMARKS

The title has been amended to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, as required by the Examiner.

The specification has been amended to clarify the meaning of acronym ITX in the phrase "Mini-ITX." ITX is an acronym for "Information Technology Expanding." The mini-ITX is a type of mainboard developed by VIA Technologies, Inc., which the company describes as the IT industry's smallest form factor mainboard specification. The product is described in an attached brochure (Attachment I), and on the internet at <http://www.viaembedded.com/product/index.jsp>.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16 and 18 have been amended. Claims 3 and 25 have been canceled. New claims 27 and 28 have been added to further protect the invention. Reexamination and reconsideration of the amended application respectfully are requested.

The Examiner objected to claims 5-8 because they contain acronyms that have not been spelled out in the claims (although they have been spelled out in the specification). The Examiner requires that the acronyms be spelled out the first time they are used. Accordingly, claims 5, 7 and 16 have been amended to spell out the words represented by the acronyms LVDS, TMDS and ITX. The objections therefore no longer are applicable and accordingly should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 15 under 25 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 9 and 15 respectively are amended to change "a third cable..." and "a fourth cable..." to "a cable..." and "a cable...". The rejection therefore no longer is applicable and accordingly should be withdrawn.

Claim 1-2, 4-6 and 10-12, 17-21, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Boesch et al.* Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 3 and claim 18 has been amended to include the

limitations of claim 25. The Examiner acknowledges that *Boesch et al.* do not disclose the limitations of claims 3 ad 25. The remainder of the rejected claims listed above depend directly or indirectly from amended claims 1 and 8. The rejection therefore no longer is applicable and accordingly should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 7-8, 13-14, 16, 22-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Boesch et al.* in view of *Baker*. The rejection respectfully is traversed.

As noted above, independent claim 1 is rewritten to include the limitation of the claim 3, and independent claim 18 is rewritten to include the limitation of the claim 25. In particular, claims 3 and 18 have been amended to clarify that the electronic device of the invention includes a supporting member, disposed between the motherboard and the converter board, supporting the converter board and maintaining a predetermined distance between the motherboard and the converter board.

Neither *Boesch et al.* nor *Baker* discloses the key characteristics of the supporting member that the supporting member can not only keep the two boards separated, but help the converter board to be mounted on the mother board. The Examiner asserts that *Baker* shows a supporting member 40 between two boards. However, with reference to the relied upon statement of *Baker*,

*The support stand 36 includes a base 38 suitably securable to the desk 32 and having an upstanding post portion 40 with a pivot connection section 42 at its upper end...*[column 4, line 37-40 of *Baker*].

though *Baker* discloses an upstanding post portion 40 introduced to connect the pivot connection section 42 with the desk 32 (as illustrated in Fig. 3), no suggestion is made, nor can a conclusion be reached that the upstanding post portion 40 is utilized to keep two circuit boards separated. Rather *Baker* is directed to mounting a computer monitor on a desk. Hence, this ground of

rejection is unwarranted. A person of ordinary skilled would not look to such a teach for the solution produced by the claimed invention. Additionally, the invention also produces another significant feature that the converter board of the invention, unlike that of *Boesch et al.*, can be directly mounted on the motherboard without any extra connector or connection board.

These features have been further elucidated in new independent claim 27 and depending claim 28. Therefore amended independent claims 1 and 18, the remaining original claims, all depending from claims 1 or 18, and new claims 27 and 28, are deemed clearly to be patentable, and the rejection accordingly should be withdrawn.

Based on the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such a Notice, with allowed claims 1, 2, 4 – 24 and 26-28, earnestly is solicited. Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

March 10, 2005

Date



Steven M. Rabin - Reg. No. 29,102  
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.

Telephone: (202) 371-8976

Telefax: (202) 408-0924

CUSTOMER NO. 23995

SMR:pjl

AMENDMENT

10

(10/646,733)